

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

**STATUS OF THE APPLICATION**

Claims 1-41 were pending in this application and examined.

Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 20, 22, and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Okamoto et al. (U.S. Patent App. Publication 2002/0065814; hereinafter "Okamoto"). Claims 11-13, 17-18, 30-32, and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rowe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,599; hereinafter "Rowe").

Claims 2, 5, 21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto in view of Gounares et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,681,370; hereinafter "Gounares"). Claims 4 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto in view of MSDN Online Web Workshop (hereinafter "MOWW"). Claims 9-10 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto in view of Schultz (U.S. Patent No. 5,721,902). Claims 14-16 and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe in view of Okamoto. Claims 19 and 38-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe in view of Okamoto.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 4-21, and 23-41, and canceled claims 3 and 22 without prejudice. Claims 1, 2, 4-21, and 23-41 remain pending in this application after entry of this amendment.

**THE SPECIFICATION**

Applicants have amended the specification to correct inadvertently introduced typographical mistakes. Applicants submit that no new subject matter has been introduced by the amendments.

THE CLAIMS

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 20, 22, and 25-27

Applicants submit that claim 1, 3, 6-8, 20, 22, and 25-27 are not anticipated or suggested by Okamoto for at least the following reasons:

(a) Applicants submit that Okamoto does not show or suggest each and every feature recited in Applicants' claim 1, as amended. For example, claim 1 recites:

receiving information identifying a set of one or more concepts;  
determining a set of text patterns associated with the set of concepts, the set of  
text patterns comprising one or more text patterns associated with the one or more concepts in the  
set of concepts;

searching the document to identify occurrences of one or more text patterns  
from the set of text patterns in the document; and

displaying the document using the browser such that the occurrences of the text  
patterns in the document are annotated. (Applicants' claim 1, emphasis added)

As recited above in claim 1, information identifying a set of concepts is received (e.g., received from the user), and a set of text patterns is then determined corresponding to the one or more concepts in the set of concepts. As described in the specification, one or more text patterns may be associated with each concept. For example, as depicted in Fig. 4B, several text patterns such as "computer input device", "finger based manipulation", etc. may be associated with concept "Input Devices". The set of text patterns that is determined comprises the text patterns associated with the set of concepts. The document is then searched for occurrences in the document of text patterns in the set of text patterns. The occurrences are annotated when the document is displayed.

Applicants submit that the feature of determining a set of text patterns associated with the set of concepts is not taught or suggested by Okamoto. As best understood, in Okamoto, a query is received from a user. The query may contain one or more query terms. A document is then searched for strings in the document that match the query terms. (See Okamoto: paragraphs 0028-0035).

The Office Action contends that a "concept" recited in claim 1 is the same as a "user query" described in Okamoto. Applicants submit that this comparison is inaccurate. In Okamoto, the document is searched for terms that are provided by the user as part of the query--i.e., the query terms themselves are searched for in the document. The user thus has to explicitly specify the terms to be searched in the document. This is not the case in the present invention recited in claim 1 where concepts are provided--not query terms. A set of text patterns is then determined for the concepts and the document is then searched for the set of text patterns. Applicants thus submit that a "concept" recited in claim 1 is quite different from the "user query" described in Okamoto. Applicants thus submit that the feature of "receiving information identifying a set of concepts" is not taught by Okamoto.

Further, since the user-provided query terms are used for searching the document in Okamoto, there is no teaching or suggestion in Okamoto of determining a set of text patterns associated with the one or more concepts in the set of concepts, as recited in claim 1.

Applicants thus submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Okamoto for at least the reasons stated above. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 6-8, which depend from claim 1, are also not anticipated by Okamoto for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 1. Claim 3 has been canceled without prejudice.

Applicants further submit that independent claim 20 is also not anticipated by Okamoto for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 1. Applicants also submit that dependent claims 25-27, which depend from claim 20, are also not anticipated by Okamoto for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 20. Claim 22 has been canceled without prejudice.

**(b)** Applicants submit that Okamoto is not a proper 35 U.S.C. 102(e) reference for at least claims 1, 20, and 39.

The present application is a CIP of U.S. Non-Provisional Application No. 08/995,616 filed December 22, 1997. Applicants submit that all the elements recited in claims 1, 20 and 39 are supported by the previously filed parent application (08/995,616). Applicants thus submit that claims 1, 20, and 39 are entitled to a priority date of December 22, 1997.

The 102(e) date for Okamoto is June 30, 1998. Since this 102(e) date is past the priority date of December 22, 1997, Applicants submit that Okamoto is not a proper 102(e) reference at least for claims 1, 20, and 39.

The following table identifies examples of sections of parent application (U.S. Non-Provisional Application No. 08/995,616 filed December 22, 1997) that provide support for the features of claims 1, 20, and 39. The table below is not meant to be an exhaustive list of all the sections of parent application (08/995,616) that provide support for claims 1, 20, and 39. Support for the elements of claims 1, 20, and 39 can also be found in other sections of the parent application 08/995,616.

<b>Claim 1 (20, and 39)</b>	<b>Sections of 08/995,616 specification</b>
A computer-implemented method of displaying a document using a browser, the method comprising:	Summary section. Figs. 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, 5, 6A, 6B, 6C, 8, 9A, 9B, 10.
accessing the document;	Summary section. Pgs. 6, 7. Figs. 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, 5, 6A, 6B, 6C, 8, 9A, 9B, 10.
receiving information identifying a set of one or more concepts;	Summary section. Pgs. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. Figs. 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, 5, 6A, 6B, 6C, 8, 9A, 9B, 10.
determining a set of text patterns associated with the set of concepts, the set of text patterns comprising one or more text patterns associated with each concept in the set of concepts;	Summary section. Pgs. 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. Figs. 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, 5, 6A, 6B, 6C, 8, 9A, 9B, 10.
searching the document to identify occurrences of one or more text patterns from the set of text patterns in the document; and	Summary section. Pgs. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. Figs. 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, 5, 6A, 6B, 6C, 8, 9A, 9B, 10.
displaying the document using the browser such that the occurrences of the text patterns in	Summary section. Pgs. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12. Figs. 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, 5, 6A, 6B, 6C, 8, 9A,

the document are annotated.

9B, 10.

Claims 11-13, 17-18, 30-32, and 36-37

Applicants submit that that claims 11-13, 17-18, 30-32, and 36-37 are not anticipated or suggested by Rowe for at least the following reasons:

(a) In addition to other features, claim 11 recites:

displaying a single thumbnail image in a second viewing area of the display based on the contents extracted from the multi-page document, the single thumbnail image displaying the contents of the multi-page document in a continuous form; (Applicants' claim 11, emphasis added)

As recited above, a single thumbnail is used to display contents of a multi-page document. Further, the single thumbnail displays contents of the multi-page document in a continuous manner, i.e., without any breaks in the pages, etc. Applicants submit that these features recited in claim 1 are not anticipated by Rowe.

In Rowe, page icons 50 or thumbnails are used to represent pages of a document. Each thumbnail represents a separate page of the document. (See Rowe: col. 12 lines 26-36 and Fig. 2b). Accordingly, as depicted in Fig. 2b of Rowe, for a multi-page document, multiple thumbnails 50 are displayed, each thumbnail representing a page of the multi-page document. This is substantially different from the present invention recited in claim 11 where a single thumbnail is used to display the contents of a multi-page document

Further, Applicants submit that in Rowe, the thumbnails corresponding to the pages of the document are displayed in a disconnected non-continuous form. As depicted in Fig. 2b of Rowe, several thumbnails 50 are displayed, each thumbnail corresponding to a page of a multi-page document. The individual thumbnails are not connected to each other and thus they are not displayed in a continuous manner—the contents of a multi-page document are thus displayed in a discontinuous disconnected page by page manner. This is substantially different from the present invention recited in claim 11 where the contents of a multi-page document are displayed in a continuous form in a single thumbnail.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the feature of displaying a single thumbnail that displays contents of the multi-page document in a continuous manner, as recited in claim 11, is not anticipated or suggested by Rowe.

**(b) Claim 11 also recites:**

extracting contents of the multi-page document, the contents comprising text and one or more elements;

displaying a single thumbnail image in a second viewing area of the display based on the contents extracted from the multi-page document, the single thumbnail image displaying the contents of the multi-page document in a continuous form; (Applicants' claim 11, emphasis added)

As recited above in claim 11, in order to display the single thumbnail, contents are extracted from the multi-page document. The contents comprise text and one or more elements (e.g., forms, images, multimedia content, etc. as described in Applicants' specification on page 28, lines 24-30). The single thumbnail is built and displayed based on the extracted contents. Displaying the single thumbnail based upon the extracted contents offers several advantages. For example, as described in Applicants' specification on pg. 29 lines 6-10:

“By building a thumbnail image using the extracted elements and text, the present invention is capable of dynamically updating the thumbnail image contents when one or more elements of HTML document 608 are modified/manipulated. The thumbnail according to the teachings of the present invention thus comprises “dynamic” entities which make the thumbnail contents highly configurable. This is substantially different from the “static” nature of thumbnails provided by prior art techniques such as thumbnails provided by Adobe’s Acrobat related products.”

Applicants submit that the features of extracting contents from the document and using the extracted contents to display the single thumbnail are not disclosed by Rowe. The section (col. 11 line 66 – col. 12 line 36) of Rowe identified in the Office Action describes how a page 40 (See Fig. 2b of Rowe) is displayed in Rowe. Applicants submit that page 40 of Rowe is not the same as the “thumbnail” recited in claim 11. Applicants thus respectfully submit that the section of Rowe identified in the Office Action fails to teach extracting contents (including text

and one or more elements) from a document for purposes of building and displaying a thumbnail image.

Moreover, Rowe indicates that the document is displayed based upon Acrobat reader or Acrobat Exchange, available from Adobe Systems (See Rowe: col. 11 lines 59-63). As already indicated in the Applicants' specification, Adobe's Acrobat related products provide a "static" thumbnail—i.e., the thumbnail cannot dynamically change as it is not based upon extracted content. As a result, it is substantially different from the "dynamic" thumbnail provided by embodiments of the present invention which is enabled by extracting the contents from the document and displaying the single thumbnail based upon the extracted contents, as recited in claim 11.

Applicants thus submit that the features of extracting contents of the multi-page document and displaying the single thumbnail based upon the extracted contents, recited in claim 11, are not anticipated by Rowe (or by Okamoto or any of the other cited references).

In light of the above, Applicants submit that claim 11 is not anticipated by Rowe for at least the reasons described above in (a) and (b). Applicants further submit that dependent claims 12-13 and 17-18, which depend from claim 11, are also not anticipated by Rowe for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 11.

Applicants submit that independent claim 30 is also not anticipated by Rowe for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 11. Applicants submit that dependent claims 31-32 and 36-37, which depend from claim 30, are also not anticipated by Okamoto for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 30.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 2, 4, 5, 9, 10

Claims 2, 4, 5, 9, and 10 depend from claim 1. As described above, claim 1 recites several features (e.g., "determining a set of text patterns associated with the set of concepts") that are not anticipated or suggested by Okamoto. Applicants submit that the deficiencies of Okamoto are not corrected by Gounares, Schultz, or MOWW. Neither of these references discloses the features of receiving concepts, determining a set of text patters

associated with the concepts, searching a document for the text patterns, and annotating occurrences of the text patterns in the document when the document is displayed. Accordingly, even if the references were combined as suggested by the Office Action (even though there appears to be no motivation or suggestion for the combination), the resultant combination would not teach or suggest the features of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not made obvious by the combination of the references.

Applicants further submit that dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 9, and 10, which depend from claim 1, are also not made obvious by a combination of the cited references (Okamoto and Rowe or Schultz or Gounares or MOWW) for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 1. Further, the dependent claims recite additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited references, considered individually or in combination.

Claims 21, 23, 24, 28, 29

Applicants submit that claims 21, 23, 24, 28, and 29 are not made obvious by a combination of the cited references (Okamoto and Rowe or Schultz or Gounares or MOWW) for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claims 2, 4, 5, 9, and 10.

Claims 14-16 and 33-35

Claims 14-16 and 33-35 depend from claims 11 and 30 respectively. As described above, claims 11 and 30 recite several features that are not anticipated or suggested by Rowe. Applicants submit that the deficiencies of Rowe are not corrected by Okamoto. Accordingly, even if Rowe and Okamoto were combined as suggested by the Office Action (even though there appears to be no motivation or suggestion for the combination), the resultant combination would not teach or suggest the features recited in claims 11 and 30. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 11 and 30 are not made obvious by a combination of the references.

Applicants further submit that dependent claims 14-16 and 33-35 which depend from claims 11 and 30 respectively are also not made obvious by a combination of Rowe and Okamoto for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claims 11 and 30. Further, the

dependent claims recite additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited references, considered individually or in combination.

Claims 19, 38, and 41

Applicants submit that claim 19 recites several features from claim 1 which are not taught or suggested by Okamoto (for details, see discussion above with regards to claim 1 and Okamoto). Claim 19 also recites several features from claim 11 which are not taught or suggested by Rowe (for details, see discussion above with regards to claim 11 and Rowe). Further, Applicants submit that the deficiencies of Okamoto are not cured by Rowe and the deficiencies of Rowe are not cured by Okamoto. Accordingly, Applicants submit that even if Rowe and Okamoto were combined as suggested by the Office Action (although there appears to be no motivation or suggestion for the combination), the resultant combination would not teach or suggest the features recited in claim 19. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 19 is not made obvious by the combination of Okamoto and Rowe.

Applicants further submit that independent claims 38 and 41 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for allowing claim 19.

Claim 39

Applicants submit that claim 39 is not anticipated or suggested by Okamoto for a similar rationale as discussed above for claim 1. Further, the deficiencies of Okamoto are not corrected by Rowe. Accordingly, even if Okamoto and Rowe were combined as suggested by the Office Action (even though there appears to be no motivation or suggestion for the combination), the resultant combination would not suggest the features recited in claim 39. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 39 is not made obvious by the combination of the Okamoto and Rowe.

Claim 40

Applicants submit that claim 40 is not anticipated or suggested by Rowe for a similar rationale as discussed above for claim 11. Further, the deficiencies of Rowe are not

Appl. No. 09/636,039  
Amtd. dated July 12, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of February 12, 2004

PATENT

corrected by Okamoto. Accordingly, even if Rowe and Okamoto were combined as suggested by the Office Action (even though there appears to be no motivation or suggestion for the combination), the resultant combination would not suggest the features recited in claim 40. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 40 is not made obvious by the combination of the Rowe and Okamoto.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

*S. B. Kotwal*

Sujit B. Kotwal  
Reg. No. 43,336

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 650-326-2422  
SBK:km

60152586 v1